



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/459,493	12/13/1999	MOSHE RUBIN	P-9038-US	1209
7590	11/03/2005		EXAMINER	
Eitan Law Group c/o Landon IP, Inc. Suite 450 1700 Diagonal Road Alexandria, VA 22314				COLIN, CARL G
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2136
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/459,493	RUBIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Carl Colin	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1, 3 - 14, 16 - 27, 29 - 36, 38 - 53, 55 - 66, 68 - 80 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3 - 14, 16 - 27, 29 - 36, 38 - 53, 55 - 66, 68 - 80 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/24/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. In response to communications filed on 8/24/2005, for a request to continue examination, the following claims 1, 3 - 14, 16 - 27, 29 - 36, 38 - 53, 55 - 66 and 68 - 80 are presented for examination.

2.1 Applicant's arguments, pages 12-14, filed on 8/24/2005, with respect to the 112 rejection of claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, 29-36, 38-53, 55-66, and 68-80 have been fully considered, and they are persuasive. Applicant has previously amended the independent claims to overcome Murphy by reciting recognizing individual pixel locations as protected or unprotected "without comparison to a template of pixel locations". Upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made. Claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, 29-36, 38-53, 55-66, and 68-80 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mast in view of Dwin.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.1 **Claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, 29 - 36, 38-53, 55-66, and 68-80** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,881,287 to **Mast** in view of US Patent 5,986,676 to **Dwin et al.**

3.2 **As per claim 1, Mast** substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images from being copied from a video RAM, (see column 3, lines 25-34 and column 9, lines 60-67). **Mast** discloses the step of transmitting stored pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM (column 3, lines 25-57). As defined in the dictionary, the pixels are the basic units of the composition of the image disclosed by **Mast**. **Mast** also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49; and lines 49-57; and column 10, lines 57-61). **Mast** discloses in prior art (columns 1-3) many examples of modifying pixel

data prior to arrival at the video RAM. **Mast** further discloses the steps of modifying pixel data by encryption before transmitting to end users, prior to its being received by the video RAM, thereby generating modified pixel data within which individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected (see column 7, lines 34-47); and after instruction to copy pixel data from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum that is recognized as being protected, with substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to it's being received by the video RAM and recognizing individual pixel data as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum without comparison to a template of pixel locations. However, **Dwin et al** in an analogous art teaches reading protection data in the lock buffer (non-display section) and generates control signals, which inhibit the writing of data into the protected areas of the display section (see abstract). **Dwin et al** discloses modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to being displayed, which meets the recitation of modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to it's being received by the video RAM, for example (see column 8, lines 35-67; column 5, lines 50-53 and column 7, lines 1-37), and further discloses recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum, for example (see column 8, lines 35-67; column 5, lines 50-53 and column 7, lines 1-37) with the advantage that it enables to know which location of the data to be displayed must be protected by setting all the protect bits corresponding to the pixels in the destination for the object (see column 8, lines 14-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** by modifying least significant bits of stored

pixel data prior to its being received by the video RAM and recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum as taught by **Dwin et al.** (see column 7, lines 10-40). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so because modifying the significant pixels provides control and identification of data locations that need to be protected before displaying on the screen, thus any portion of the screen may be so protected by reading the protection data as suggested by **Dwin et al** (see column 7, lines 38-61 and column 8, lines 14-67).

As per claims 3, 29, and 55, Dwin et al. discloses wherein pixel data includes red, green, and blue color components said modifying sets the least significant bits within any pixel data of any color that meets the recitation of limitation of wherein pixel data includes red, green, and blue color components and wherein, said modifying sets the least significant bits within pixel data of the blue components, such modification is also well known in the art the (see column 6, lines 9-41). These claims are therefore rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 4, Mast substantially discloses rendering pixel data in video RAM on a video display device, (see column 1, lines 40-47).

As per claims 5, 30, and 56, Dwin et al. discloses the limitation of rendering pixel data that is visually similar to the stored pixel data when rendered on a video display device, for example (see column 7, lines 25-61). These claims are therefore rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 6, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by a screen capture command (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 7, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by command to copy screen data to a clipboard (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claims 8, 32, and 60, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the protected pixel data is pixel data for at least one protected digital image (see fig. 8 and column 10, line 52 through column 12).

As per claim 9, Mast substantially teaches the claimed method of claim 8. **Mast** discloses sending protected image to end user but does not specifically disclose downloading the at least one protected image over the Internet, which is well known in the art.

As per claims 12 and 34, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

As per claims 13 and 35, Mast discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted stored pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

As per claim 10, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). Mast further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

As per claim 11, Mast discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

As per claim 14, Mast teaches the limitations of claim 14 using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). Claim 14 recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 1 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, a digital filter to identify and modify pixel data, and processors to replace or copy information to memory. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by Mast can be applied in a system.

Claims 16, 38, and 68 are similar to the rejected claim 3 except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, claims 16, 38, and 68 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 17, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 14. Claim 17 is similar to the rejected claim 4. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 4.

Claims 18, 40, and 70 are similar to the rejected **claim 5** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 18, 40, and 70** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 5**.

As per claim 19, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 14. Claim 19 recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are distinct data busses. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system has distinct data buses to transfer data for storage (see column 4, lines 19-28).

As per claim 20, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 14. Claim 20 recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are the same data bus. The fact of using the same data bus instead of two distinct data buses may reduce cost. However, having one bus may slow down the process of transmitting data, and furthermore, it does not provide any backup if the bus fails. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same bus or distinct data buses (see column 4, lines 19-28).

Claims 21, 41, and 75 are similar to the rejected **claim 8** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 21, 41, and 75** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 8**.

Claims 22, 42, and 76 are similar to the rejected **claim 9** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 22, 42, and 76** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 9**.

As per claims 23-26, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 14. **Claims 23-26** are similar to the rejected **claims 10-13** respectively. Therefore, **claims 23-26** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 10-13**.

As per claim 27, claim 27 recites some of the limitations of the rejected claim 1. Therefore, **claim 27** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 1**.

Claims 31 and 57 are similar to the rejected **claim 5**. Therefore, **claims 31 and 57** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 5**.

Claims 33 and 61 are similar to the rejected **claim 9**. Therefore, **claims 33 and 61** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 9**.

As per claim 36, Mast substantially teaches the limitations of claim 36 using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 36** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 1 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage and a digital filter to identify and modify pixel data. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

Claims 39 and 69 are similar to the rejected **claim 4** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 39 and 69** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 4**.

Claims 43 and 79 are similar to the rejected **claim 12** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 43 and 79** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 12**.

Claims 44 and 80 are similar to the rejected **claim 13** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claims 44 and 80** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 13**.

As per claim 45, Mast substantially teaches a method for protecting pixel data located in a video RAM from being copied. **Mast** also discloses replacing protected pixel data with substitute pixel data, after instruction to copy pixel data from the video RAM (see column 3,

lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1). (See also column 2, lines 13-25). **Mast** discloses that encryption fails to protect pixel data within the video memory because of the need to be displayed (see column 1, lines 62-66). **Mast** does not explicitly teach providing pixel data with marking so that individual pixel datum is recognizable as being protected or unprotected; and recognizing individual pixel data as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum without comparison to a template of pixel locations. However, **Dwin et al** in an analogous art teaches reading protection data in the lock buffer (non-display section) and generates control signals, which inhibit the writing of data into the protected areas of the display section (see abstract). **Dwin et al** discloses modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to being displayed, which meets the recitation of modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to it's being received by the video RAM, for example (see column 8, lines 35-67; column 5, lines 50-53 and column 7, lines 1-37), and further discloses recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum, for example (see column 8, lines 35-67; column 5, lines 50-53 and column 7, lines 1-37) with the advantage that it enables to know which location of the data to be displayed must be protected by setting all the protect bits corresponding to the pixels in the destination for the object (see column 8, lines 14-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** by modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to its being received by the video RAM and recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum as taught by **Dwin et al.** (see column 7, lines 10-40). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so because modifying the significant

pixels provides control and identification of data locations that need to be protected before displaying on the screen, thus any portion of the screen may be so protected by reading the protection data as suggested by **Dwin et al** (see column 7, lines 38-61 and column 8, lines 14-67).

As per claim 46, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by a screen capture command (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 47, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the pixel data is copied from the video RAM by command to copy screen data to a clipboard (column 10, lines 52-66 and columns 11-12).

As per claim 48, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). **Mast** further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

As per claim 49, Mast discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

As per claim 50, Mast teaches the limitations of **claim 50** using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 50** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 45 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system comprising a data bus and a pixel processor. A computer system has data buses to transfer data for storage, and processors to replace individual pixel datum. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

Claim 51 is similar to the rejected **claim 10** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claim 51** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 10**.

Claim 52 is similar to the rejected **claim 11** except for incorporating the claimed method into a system. Therefore, **claim 51** is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claim 11**.

As per claim 53, Mast substantially teaches a method for protecting digital images from being copied from a video RAM. **Mast** discloses the steps of modifying the stored pixel data so as to mark it as being protected and thereafter transmitting stored pixel data including the modified protecting pixel data from a computer memory to a video RAM (see column 7, lines 34-47 see column 3, lines 10-14; column 2, lines 13-25). (See also prior art columns 1-3).

Mast also discloses the step of identifying protected image within the image in memory that meets the recitation of identifying the protected pixel data within the stored pixel data (see column 3, lines 30-49 and column 10, lines 57-61); and in response to pixel data being copied from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum copied from the video RAM, that is

protected, with substitute pixel datum (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1); and discloses after instruction to copy pixel data from the video RAM, replacing individual pixel datum that is recognized as being protected, with substitute pixel datum without comparison to a template of pixel locations (column 3, lines 30-49, column 9, lines 59 et seq., and column 10, line 53 through column 11, line 1). **Mast** does not explicitly teach modifying least significant bits of protected pixel data prior so as to mark it as being protected. However, **Dwin et al** in an analogous art teaches reading protection data in the lock buffer (non-display section) and generates control signals, which inhibit the writing of data into the protected areas of the display section (see abstract). **Dwin et al** discloses modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to being displayed, which meets the recitation of modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to it's being received by the video RAM, for example (see column 8, lines 35-67; column 5, lines 50-53 and column 7, lines 1-37), and further discloses recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum, for example (see column 8, lines 35-67; column 5, lines 50-53 and column 7, lines 1-37) with the advantage that it enables to know which location of the data to be displayed must be protected by setting all the protect bits corresponding to the pixels in the destination for the object (see column 8, lines 14-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Mast** by modifying least significant bits of stored pixel data prior to its being received by the video RAM and recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected or unprotected based on the least significant bits of the datum as taught by **Dwin et al.** (see column 7, lines 10-40). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so because modifying the significant

pixels provides control and identification of data locations that need to be protected before displaying on the screen, thus any portion of the screen may be so protected by reading the protection data as suggested by **Dwin et al** (see column 7, lines 38-61 and column 8, lines 14-67).

Claims 58-59 are similar to the rejected **claims 6-7** respectively. Therefore, **claims 58-59** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 6-7**.

Claims 62-63 are similar to the rejected **claims 10-11** respectively. Therefore, **claims 62-63** are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of **claims 10-11**.

As per claim 64, Mast discloses the limitation of wherein the protected pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47).

As per claim 65, Mast discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted stored pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

As per claim 66, Mast teaches the limitations of **claim 66** using a method and an apparatus in a computer system (see column 4, lines 19-28). **Claim 66** recites the same limitation as the rejected claim 53 except for incorporating the claimed methods into a system comprising a data bus and a pixel processor. A computer system has data buses to transfer data

for storage, and processors to modify and replace pixel data. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that the method disclosed by **Mast** can be applied in a system.

As per claim 71, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 71** recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are distinct data busses. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system has distinct data buses to transfer data for storage (see column 4, lines 19-28).

As per claim 72, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 72** recites the limitation of wherein said first data bus and said second data bus are the same data bus. The fact of using the same data bus instead of two distinct data buses may reduce cost. However, having one bus may slow down the process of transmitting data and furthermore it does not provide any backup if the bus fails. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same bus or distinct data buses (see column 4, lines 19-28).

As per claim 73, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 73** recites the limitation of wherein said first pixel processor and said second pixel processor are distinct processors. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system may have distinct processors for different tasks (see also column 4, lines 19-28).

As per claim 74, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66. **Claim 74** recites the limitation of wherein said first pixel processor and said second pixel processor are the same

processors. The fact of using the same processor instead of two distinct processors may reduce cost. It is apparent to one skilled in the art to have a system using a CPU as a processor to perform all the tasks. It is apparent to one skilled in the art that a computer system is capable of using either the same processor or distinct processors (see also column 4, lines 19-28).

As per claim 77, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66 and further discloses the limitation of wherein the stored pixel data is encrypted pixel data (see column 7, lines 20-47). **Mast** further discloses that the image files are protected from misappropriation with some form of encryption and suggests to use other encryption schemes than the one disclosed (see column 7, lines 40-47). Therefore, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an encryption scheme, to have the substitute pixel datum encrypted to indicate that they are protected images.

As per claim 78, Mast discloses the claimed system of claim 66 and further discloses the limitation of decoding encrypted pixel data (see column 9, lines 8-20).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patents : 5,875,249 Mintzer et al ; 5,764,770 Schipper et al ; 6,212,329 Sugahara ; 6,668,246 Yeung et al ; 5,875,249 Mintzer et al ; 6,275,599 Adler et al ; 5,570,306 Soo ; 6,877,005 Hunter et al.

These patents pertain to image authentication and copyright protection for modifying individual pixel datum and recognizing individual pixel datum as being protected.

4.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 571-272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cc

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

October 30, 2005

Ayaz Sheikh
AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100